## APPEAL NO. 032830 FILED DECEMBER 8, 2003

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing (CCH) was held on September 18, 2003. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issues by deciding that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and that the claimant did not have disability resulting from an alleged injury of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The claimant appeals, contending that the hearing officer's decision is against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence and that the hearing officer did not allow him to plead an aggravation of a preexisting condition. The respondent (carrier) asserts that sufficient evidence supports the hearing officer's decision.

## **DECISION**

Affirmed.

The claimant had the burden to prove that he sustained a compensable injury as defined by Section 401.011(10) and that he had disability as defined by Section 401.011(16). Conflicting evidence was presented at the CCH on the disputed issues. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. Section 410.165(a). As the finder of fact, the hearing officer resolves the conflicts in the evidence and determines what facts have been established. The record does not reflect that the hearing officer prevented the claimant from claiming that he sustained an aggravation of a preexisting condition; rather, the record reflects that the hearing officer was attempting to obtain clarification as to what preexisting condition was claimed to have been aggravated. The hearing officer's decision reflects that she was not persuaded that the claimant proved that he sustained a new and distinct injury or that a preexisting condition was aggravated by the claimed incident at work on . Although there is conflicting evidence in this case, we conclude that the hearing officer's decision is supported by sufficient evidence and is not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

We affirm the hearing officer's decision and order.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **AMERICAN CASUALTY COMPANY OF READING, PENNSYLVANIA** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

## CT CORPORATION 350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.

	Robert W. Potts Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Judy L. S. Barnes Appeals Judge	
Elaine M. Chaney Appeals Judge	